UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

AMERICAN POLICY

By Salmon O. Levinson

VOLUME CXXIII NUMBER 7

Chicago, June 5, 1939

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 99
Jottings—J. H. H. 101

ARTICLES—

American Policy—SALMON O. LEVINSON 102
Foreign Barbarism and Our Duty—VICTOR S. YARROS 110
The Deaf and Blind in Germany—HELEN KELLER 111

POETRY—

Wisdom Born of Spring—FLORA WHITE 101

CORRESPONDENCE—

Help for One Who Has Helped Many—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS 112

THE FIELD—

German Opposition to Hitler Grows Rapidly—*The Hour* 98
"Christianity—Religion for Slaves"—*Nofrontier News Service* 112

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

German Opposition to Hitler Grows Rapidly

An anti-Hitler slogan, painted a few days ago in giant letters on a wall near Duesseldorf, "Remove Hitler who leads us to catastrophe—Hitler is war, we want peace," is but one of many examples of the increased activities of the opposition in Germany. Reports from all parts of the country confirm the growth of the so-called Underground Movement giving the Gestapo many headaches. This important intensification of opposition activities goes back as far as September when fear and panic of war paved the way for an anti-Hitler feeling in the country to an extent previously unknown and opened new possibilities for the groups which, doing patiently their mole-work, have waited for their turn.

The German people no longer feel that Hitler's policy will preserve peace. Even a year ago, when the first news of Hitler's plans against Czechoslovakia began to circulate, a certain nervousness could be noted among the populace. In September, leaflets speaking of war danger appeared in Berlin, Hamburg, Munich, Cologne, and all big cities of the Rhineland. The secret radio station (Freedom-Station 29.8) poured in news about the war preparations and stirred up fear of catastrophe. Stickers with anti-war slogans made their appearance in great numbers, and on quite a few trains transporting reservists and war material there was a chalked or painted call, "Down with War!" An anti-governmental demonstration, of the type unseen in Berlin for many years, was staged when the armored car division, parading through the capital, was received by women in the throng with shouts, "We want peace!"

The Munich agreement and the appeasement policy had naturally enough their effects on such opposition activities. These activities slowed down in October, although not as much as in previous years. The November pogroms brought another rise of underground activities. Its base was the horror which the killing of defenseless Jews, the burning of synagogues, and the sacking of Jewish shops had produced in the majority of the population.

The steady growth of the German opposition finds its counterpart in governmental and Gestapo measures. No less than 120,000 informers of the secret police watch tendencies of opposition in churches and church organizations, factories, offices, in the army, among the nobility and conservative circles.

The Nazi watchdogs in apartment houses (Blockwarts) have received instruction to watch closely who of the tenants is listening to foreign or clandestine broadcasting stations — these "bonds upon the soul," as the Nazis call them. The Freedom-Station and

(*Continued on page* 112)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIII MONDAY, JUNE 5, 1939 No. 7

HUMANITY

That society which, to maintain itself, oppresses individual souls and sacrifices their rights and their culture to its own tranquillity is like a mother who should devour her children.

—*Auguste Sabatier*

"THERE WILL BE NO WAR"!

We realize that, before this Editorial can be printed, there may be war in Europe. Yet there are those wiser than ourselves who say no, and one of these is the author of an article in a recent issue of *Common Sense* under the above title. This author is Dr. William Schlamm, a Czechoslovakian be it noted, and a scholar of great repute. His argument is interesting. Referring at the start to the September crisis, he ridicules the idea that Munich was due to a nervous breakdown by Daladier or "some deep-laid malicious scheme of Chamberlain." American commentators thousands of miles away know better, but Dr. Schlamm, whose country was directly involved, states that "the basic cause of collapse" was not men at all but "a set of rather revolutionary changes" which subdued Chamberlain and Daladier and also Hitler and Mussolini to "acting like puppets, as great men often do." Dr. Schlamm's thesis has to do with the aeroplane which, he says, has destroyed the imperialistic war pattern which has been responsible for most of the wars in the last one hundred years. In the nineteenth century and later, imperialistic wars were waged to get colonies, in order to secure raw materials and markets for the home factories. But now the great air fleets threaten these very factories with destruction! War cannot be fought today without the risk of losing the home productive plant. What's the use, therefore, of fighting for materials and markets for factories that are going to be wiped out in the process?

> A plate-glass merchant who hired hoodlums to smash a few thousand windowpanes in order to clear out his overloaded warehouse might be acting unethically, but he'd still have a certain logic on his side.
>
> One who started an artificial earthquake that would be certain to shatter his whole warehouse would be not only a criminal but a madman as well. One may long for such drastic action in a fit of passion, rage, or indignation, but certainly not in the name of cool calculation.

This seems to confirm Colonel Lindbergh's prophecy a few years ago that "the aeroplane has outlawed war." Dr. Schlamm sees many changes in the next few years, but not through war. Armaments do not upset his argument because he insists that these vast armaments are being built not because the nations have any intention of fighting, but rather because a preparedness program helps to lift these nations out of their current economic distress—an interesting suggestion as bearing upon preparedness in the United States! Dr. Schlamm is a cheerful prophet. We hope he's right.

NON-COOPERATION IN PALESTINE

Now comes such a chance for the practice of Gandhi's great principle of non-violent resistance, or non-violent non-coöperation, as the West has never known in all its history. Palestine presents the opportunity—Palestine as betrayed by Britain in the latter's abandonment of the mandate for Zion! The British White Paper, a frank surrender to Arab terrorism in the interest of British imperial policy, and a repudiation of everything that Britain has promised the Jews from the Balfour Declaration down, spells of course the doom of Zion if it is allowed to go into effect. *But it is not going to be allowed to go into effect!* The League of Nations, which may well spring to life in this issue, has much to say about it. The United States is a partner to the original contract, and is not going to consent to this arrant defalcation and desertion. But most of all the Jews themselves are going to determine this question—mastering, as always, their own destiny. The leaders of Zion have seen instantly that violence will get them nowhere. The original outbreaks of revolt against Britain's treason were magnificent in spirit, but futile, and worse than futile in results. Non-violent non-coöperation, after the Gandhi model in India—that's the way out! So the Jews have organized in Palestine to sever all relations with the British—to set up their own economic, political, and social life. They propose at once to paralyze the British government, and at the same time to develop instantly and to a maximum their own independent society. They will become self-sustaining economically; they will give no recognition nor obedience to British rule; they will plant new colonies on every unit of land as yet unoccupied; and, in open defiance of the immigration restrictions, they will swamp the land with settlers. As eminent an authority as Judge Brandeis has declared that the White Paper has no legal standing of any kind, and that the Jews therefore are free to take matters

into their own hands. This is a great day for Zion—a day not for weeping but for new dedication and triumph.

A PATRIOT'S DREAM

Attorney-General Murphy is a patriot's dream come true. It still seems incredible that the things this man is saying and doing are actually real. Of course, any attorney-general would shine in glorious comparison with his predecessor, Mr. Homer Cummings, whose continuance in office after his stopgap appointment on the sudden and tragic death of Senator Walsh, still remains one of the unsolved mysteries of the Rooseveltian era. Cummings' staff was incompetent; his judicial recommendations were as terrible as cheap party politics could make them; and his Supreme Court packing bill led to the first great catastrophe of the administration. But Mr. Murphy shines resplendent in his own right as one of the noblest men, most high-minded officials, and truest patriots who has ever found his way into American public life. His attitude towards civil liberties, his determination to protect and safeguard them, mark something like an epoch in our history. Never before has the chief law-officer of this government recognized that the vindication of free speech, free press, free assembly is a primary and not a secondary, an essential and not an accidental, function of his department. Mr. Murphy's address on this subject last month, before the United States Conference of Mayors, called pertinent attention to the fact that initial responsibility for the protection of civil liberties lay with the local city or town, and gave guaranty that the federal government stood ready at all times to do its part in the fight. Second only to the Attorney-General's leadership in this important field is his action in the matter of judicial appointments. For the first time in this administration, the President is getting from his legal advisor the best and not the worst suggestions for the filling of vacant judgeships. A transformation of the federal judiciary in this country is now well under way which will make the Mantons and the Thompsons henceforth impossible. All in all, it was a good day's work that the reactionary citizens of Michigan accomplished at the last election, when they defeated Mr. Murphy for Governor, and thus made it possible for him to go up higher.

THE METHODISTS' TRIUNE CHURCH

UNITY is eager to formulate and extend congratulations to our Methodist brethren on the successful accomplishment of union between the three branches of Methodism in this country—the Methodist Episcopal Church North, the Methodist Episcopal Church South, and the Protestant Methodist Church. We are inclined to regard as the most important aspect of this merger the inclusion of the Protestant Methodists, for this marks the healing of one of those ecclesiastical breaches which have so long been the scandal of Christendom. The two branches of Methodist Episcopacy were of course severed north and south by the Civil War. At the heart of this tragedy lay the Negro issue. In the present settlement we are not at all sure that this issue has been settled satisfactorily. We shall be glad to have information from our readers on this point! But that a division cleaved by war should now be rejoined in peace is in principle only a belated adjustment to the political and social life of the republic. The nation is reunited—why not the church? But the Protestant Methodist Church represented an altogether different issue, which had its roots in the sectarian confusions and alienations of Protestant controversy. That this separation should now be ended marks something like an epoch in the history of Protestant Christianity. Here is one more demonstration that the age of divine theological and ecclesiastical disputation is gone, and the age of spiritual union is come. The essential thing, as we now see, is not creed or church, dogma or diocese, but *religion*—and religion is fellowship, by which we mean "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." The Kansas City Convention was a great day for Methodism, and a great day for us all. It sets a standard to which all the wise and honest in Christendom should repair. The revival of Protestantism may well depend upon the ability of the various churches to get together and face the pagan world on a united front.

A BISHOP BIEN-VENU

BISHOP ROBERT L. PADDOCK, dead on May 17th last, was every inch a bishop, and yet was fundamentally not an ecclesiastic at all but a saint. This is the explanation of the troubles he encountered in his career. Ordained in Cleveland, he soon settled in New York in an East Side parish, and there cleaned up conditions with a courage and vigor which had much to do with the triumphant reform election of Mayor Seth Low in 1901. Known derisively as "Red-Light Bobbie," he matched in many ways the work of Dr. Parkhurst. In 1907, he was made Bishop of Eastern Oregon, and during the next fifteen years lived the life of a pioneer preacher. In cowboy shirt and hat, he journeyed thousands of miles by stagecoach, on horseback, and on foot. He held services quite as freely in the open air as before an altar, gave away virtually all of his salary, and instituted revolutionary missionary methods. He did astonishing things—refused, for example, to receive money from the National Board of Missions for his work. He said astonishing things—that his diocese with its sparse population was over-churched. He was accused sharply of laxness in the ceremonial duties of his office, and especially of coöperating too closely with other faiths. A committee appointed by the House of Bishops to investigate his work was satisfied to report in praise of his "saintliness," which was thus early discovered to be his distinctive attribute. A breakdown in health led to his resignation in 1922. In later years Bishop Paddock was active in all good works in New York, where he had retired from his churchly labors.

With increasing years came increasing radicalism in the championship of civil liberties, pacifism, industrial democracy, progressive politics, and anti-Fascism. Ardent, unselfish, courageous, pure in heart, uncompromising in spirit, he was a man without guile, a churchman without pretension, a citizen without fear or favor. His democracy was of the simplest and stanchest type, his sanctity as strong as it was gentle. His death marked the passing of one of the noblest souls in American Christianity.

RICHARD C. CABOT

Dr. Cabot died nearly a month ago, but his name remains as fresh and fragrant as ever. It is not too late, therefore, to pay him tribute. As a physician, Dr. Cabot was among the most eminent practitioners of his day. His skill as a diagnostician was remarkable, and his methods as hospital director those of a militant and yet wise reformer. His espousal in his later years of the cause of socialized medicine brought him into conflict with many of his professional colleagues, but this troubled him little, as he was always more interested in patients than in doctors. As a teacher at Harvard, first as a physician and later as a philosopher, he exercised great influence over a generation of students. He was no academician in his teaching work—no stuffy pedagogue interested in theories and abstractions. Always he was practical, and hitched up his learning with specific personal and social problems with a forthrightness which was sensational. But it is the man rather than the physician and the teacher who will be longest remembered. For sheer goodness, Dr. Cabot was unexcelled. He had the rigorous moral standards of the puritan, with none of the sternness nor hardness of that type. Always he was gracious, tender, sweet-tempered, forgiving, yet with the granite-like foundation of utter personal integrity. In his moral ideas he was an absolutist and practised what he preached, as in his belief that a lie is never under any circumstances justifiable (see his latest book, *Honesty*). Deep within him was a profound mysticism which linked him spiritually with the Transcendental tradition in his Unitarian religion. A scientist, he believed in God and practised devoutly the divine presence; a physician, he brought prayer to the bedside of his patient, and insisted that petition to God was more important than medicine; a scholar, he cherished an unshakeable faith in immortality, and died in the firm assurance of eternal life. His book, *What Men Live By,* was a statement of his credo, and is already become a classic.

Wisdom Born of Spring

The golden throated frog turning liquidity to song
Throbs forth in ecstasy "From death comes life."
He had forborne by day, trembling the while,
Till wood and mist and evening hour combined to
Give flood-tide to his empyreal sight. Then
Warningly he tells the listening few
That life is also death, gulping the hemlock
As he plunges underneath the darkly shining
Surface of a waiting pool.

FLORA WHITE.

Jottings

V. D. Savarkar, President of the All-India Congress, cabled President Roosevelt, after the latter's appeal to Hitler, as follows:

> If your note to Hitler was actuated by disinterested human anxiety for safeguarding freedom of democracy from military aggression, why not also ask Britain to withdraw armed domination over India, allowing a free, self-determined constitution?

What's the answer to that, Mr. Roosevelt?

There are ways and ways of padding attendance figures. The best we have ever heard of is that adopted by the New York World's Fair—namely, counting each day, in addition to the paid admissions, the admissions of Fair employees, workers, performers, exhibitors, and members of the press. On this basis, all records will easily be broken.

People who have to be persuaded by Pulitzer Prize awards to read such books as Marjorie Rawlings' *The Yearling,* or Carl Van Doren's *Benjamin Franklin* or Robert E. Sherwood's *Abe Lincoln in Illinois,* have something the matter with them. Yet on the day following the Pulitzer announcements, the New York *Times* contained spread ads. of all these books!

The death of R. Blashka, the German maker of the world-famous glass flowers at Harvard University, is announced. The secret of these glass flowers was conceived by Blashka, and with him dies. Here in our very midst and time is one of the "lost arts"!

Sinclair Lewis has struck a new "low" of hopelessness. Speaking of the New York World's Fair, he comments that "the world of tomorrow will be only a continuation of the world of today."

In a symposium on anti-Semitism, Warden Lawes, of Sing Sing Prison, testifies that there is no anti-Semitism in his institution. Neither among guards nor inmates is there any prejudice against Jews. Every man is regarded on his own merits *as a man.* All of which is a curious commentary on life in this topsy-turvy world!

J. H. H.

American Policy

SALMON O. LEVINSON

[Mr. Salmon O. Levinson, eminent authority on international affairs and father of the Pact of Paris, herein states unequivocally the American attitude—as evidenced by state papers, representative utterances, and governmental precedents—on crimes against the laws of humanity. He completely explodes the oft-repeated fallacy that inhumane acts against defenseless people in other countries are none of our official business; and shows that the contrary is our traditional policy. This factual and forceful statement should put an end to much of the muddled thinking on America's responsibility in the current world situation.—*Curtis W. Reese.*]

We are living in a period of seismic and kaleidoscopic changes. Some are surely of the earthquake variety and most are so rapid as to make the world gasp for breath. Let us deal with this revolutionary history as it bears upon two vital aspects of our national life.

First, what duty does America owe to outrageous violations of the laws of humanity and what guide do our governmental precedents furnish us?

Secondly, what are our duties and obligations in the protection of our American representative democracy, of our own matchless individual liberties established and cherished for 150 years?

Both these questions need clarification and emphasis in the light of present world conditions and of our own historic past. In some respects they dovetail.

American Background

Gladstone, the greatest liberal British statesman of modern times, not only paid a superlative tribute to our Constitution, but to him is also ascribed the following significant warning:

> The Government of the United States represents what is on a large scale the last experiment in establishing and maintaining free political institutions. Should that experiment fail, the world may well despair of the character and processes of government for an indefinite future.

This is a grave and timely warning. We need to defend our national inheritances not only with battleships and airplanes but with those heroic moral and spiritual qualities which have marked the evolution of the American people. This is not lackadaisical nationalism. For we are composed of all the peoples of Europe, and all who came here craved liberty and freedom of opportunity.

By reason of certain recent developments across the Atlantic it has been said that we are back to the old order—the old order of military alliances, secret diplomacy, imperialistic deals, plots, and counterplots. But America has never belonged to or been a part of the old order. Washington and Jefferson established a new order in a new world. The base of this new order is liberty, security, and peace. In his Farewell Address, Washington says: "'Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances. . . . Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand." And it is but the natural and evolutionary development from "no military alliances" to "no war" which latter is the gist of the Briand-Kellogg Pact, a purely American idea, and the first universal treaty against war between nations in the history of civilization. This Pact of Paris is the law of the world and the cornerstone of the administration's foreign policy. We cannot here refrain from doing honor to one of the leading statesmen of our generation, the Senior Senator from Idaho, whose name and devotion are imperishably identified with this fundamental law against war. The Kellogg Pact, which came into effect on July 24, 1929, has continued to be the cardinal foreign policy of three administrations. The non-recognition of territory seized or annexed by or under the brazen threat of force is an indispensable corollary to that Pact.

Washington's Farewell Address furnishes us another vital American principle so pertinent to present-day problems. It should be written in letters of gold in every church, schoolroom and legislative hall of our country. We quote the entire paragraph:

> Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of Patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great Pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of Men and Citizens. The mere Politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths, which are the instruments of investigation in Courts of Justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure—reason and experience doth forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

Dr. Arthur H. Compton, famous physicist of the University of Chicago, some months ago put our religious history thus: "Civilization, as we know it in America, has been built up by the inspiration and energy of religious-minded people."

The European scene today emphasizes the enduring wisdom of Washington's political last will and testament. His words of advice shine like stars in the American firmament. Indeed, Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Madison, and Hamilton are recognized as the greatest governmental geniuses in history. As Ben Jonson said of Shakespeare: They are "not of an age but for all time."

Let us consider together the position the United States occupies in present world complications; what are our duties, our rights, and what precedents our own political history provide for our guidance. First of all, permit us to make it clear that we hold in our hearts no hostility, no enmity to any nation, to any peoples on the face of the earth. Our America covets no territory, is in fact moving in the other direction in the Philippines, has no traditional or war grudge against any country. On the contrary our people, comprising naturalized citizens and their descendants from practically every nation of the globe, are deeply interested, spiritually and materially, in the welfare and security of all peoples. To this end America would gladly join in or lead any movement that has for its prime objective a reuniting of the family of nations, the readjustment of the maladjustments—financial, economic, and territorial—resulting from the Great War and its turbulent aftermath, which, without creating new and dangerous problems and precedents, would reasonably serve to promote justice and contentment among all

peoples. Our international diplomacy has sometimes been criticized as weak and ineffective. This criticism largely arises from its openness and freedom from intrigue. For example, in the matter of war: In 1898 President McKinley announced as an American policy that we will fight no wars of aggression or conquest and will accept no spoils of war. In 1917 President Wilson reiterated this policy in even broader and more generous terms. On this unprecedented policy, proclaimed by a Republican as well as by a Democratic President, the American people stand firm as a rock.

Consider also our position and conduct in the World War. We were a belligerent in that conflict only nineteen months. Yet in that short time we invested a sum far greater than any other participant did in the four years of its duration, namely, the colossal amount of 45 billion dollars. Likewise we organized and equipped an army of four million boys, who, despite necessarily scant training, won the admiration of the world for their bravery and patriotism. Unquestionably American participation tipped the scales to an Allied victory. But when the victors sat around the peace table, the United States alone among the victors refused to touch a dollar of the huge German reparations or a foot of conquered territory. Thus by our deeds did we immortalize the American policy announced by Presidents McKinley and Wilson. No other nation in the history of mankind ever pursued such an unselfish and generous course in war or peace. And though we have suffered the severest economic and financial losses as a part of the shattering effects of the World War, we have since the Armistice not only borne no malice or hostility towards our former enemies, but both our government and our people have made generous loans for rehabilitation purposes to Germany, to Austria, and to Hungary, aggregating billions of dollars. Where can history furnish a parallel to this conduct?

America's Right and Duty When Laws of Humanity are Violated

In view of these things it is not only the right under the comity of nations but also the moral duty of the United States to make its voice heard in Europe, to protest the inhumane outrages that, to the shame of civilization and Christianity, are being perpetrated on innocent people by the most brutal methods known to modern times. These outrages include persecution of religion and race, denial of freedom of conscience (which is and must always be accompanied by loss of freedom of the press), the destruction of the very texture of Christian civilization, the tortures of concentration camps, the illegal confiscation of property of the persecuted, the denial of all protection of law by making their victims outlaws by sovereign decree, and finally the expulsion of these despoiled and helpless victims, thereby creating hundreds of thousands of homeless refugees who must either starve and die or be foisted without moral or legal right upon the governmental and private charity of other nations.

All these outrages are typified and unbelievably perpetrated by and in Nazi Germany, although some other nations are brazenly violating treaties freely entered into, and using violence and inhumane methods to secure imperialistic and dictatorial objectives; other nations are throttling liberty of conscience, of speech, and of the press. And to avoid any possible misunderstanding, the fact is, and almost every American knows, that we have no finer quality of patriotic, peace-loving, industrious and educated citizens than the many millions of our own Germans, both naturalized and native born. If a poll should be taken of all Americans of German descent it would come as near showing unanimous opposition to religious and racial persecutions, denial of due process of law and lawless confiscations of property as would any other group of our American citizenry.

From Von Steuben in our revolutionary struggle, who deservedly stands on a parity with LaFayette as a foreign friend of American liberty, through the great Carl Schurz to the present time, no right-thinking person has ever questioned the marvelous contribution to freedom, culture, art, science, and religion with which the Germans have enriched American soil. But facts inside Nazi Germany, though kept from their own people, are shockingly known here and must be faced and dealt with as a menace to our own country, to the very foundations of religion and hence to civilization itself.

The persecution of minority groups began in Nazi Germany shortly after the advent of Hitler as Chancellor in January, 1933. Spoliation and expulsion of the Jews had been in Hitler's original National Socialist platform. But soon after assuming power he crushed and oppressed Labor Unions, the Social Democrats, and all political opposition. It is estimated that Labor Unions' property to the extent of 50 million dollars was confiscated, and the Unions destroyed.

In order to give color of justification to the developing cruelties of anti-Semitism, and to furnish a basis for excruciating laws, the spurious theory of "Aryanism" was devised for the purpose. If anyone will look into the Encyclopedia Britannica, or the very recent discussion at Cambridge, England, he will find that the word "Aryan" refers only to language or speech. It does not relate to blood, or soil, or race, or color of eyes or hair; solely to language and speech. But the Nazis have corrupted the word to their own uses to mean "Nordic" or, as formerly known, "Norman." A couplet of Tennyson might enlighten the Nazis on their own theory of "Aryanism":

> Kind hearts are more than coronets,
> And simple faith than Norman blood.

In order to bring into clearer vision to everyone, and particularly to bring home to the Germans how outrageous these "non-Aryan" persecutions and oppressions are, let us make the following suppositions:

1. Suppose that the United States literally adopted and accepted the Nazi definition of "Aryanism," namely, those of 100 per cent pure "Aryan" blood under the present Nazi laws.

2. Then suppose our government enacted identic punitive laws against all our German "Aryan" citizens. In other words, suppose America should suddenly rise up against German so-called "Aryans," deprive them of all political and civic rights, despoil them of their property, put them in concentration camps at the will of our President, and, finally, having drained them dry of money and property, exile them as refugees to wither and die unless these millions of innocent and helpless people were voluntarily befriended by other nations. For we would merely be doing exactly the same thing, only in reverse, that the Nazis have done to their so-called "non-Aryan" citizens. And we would be doing it with the some moral right, to wit, none, and with the same legal right, if we can imagine the American people enacting such inhumane laws.

3. What is not supposition is that if we did such things, America would rightly be called the pariah of nations; we would surely have lost all sense of morality, humanity, and international honor.

These religious and racial persecutions are so well known to the American people through our most dependable newspapers and international press that it is wholly unnecessary to harrow again our feelings of shame and pity by their recital. But if Herr Hitler challenges the truth of these charges of inhumane conduct, the United States will gladly join in the appointment of an independent high-class committee to ascertain and report the real facts. Indeed, we would personally welcome an open and full investigation.

Before calling the roll of great Englishmen and Americans, official and lay, who have protested and condemned acts of inhumanity and religious persecution, we set forth a few of the Nazi persecutions of other religious denominations, Protestant and Catholic.

The Case of Dr. Niemoeller

Consider the case of the Reverend Dr. Martin Niemoeller, the great Lutheran Protestant pastor. He was the Minister of the Jesus Christ Evangelical Lutheran Church of Dahlhem, Berlin. During the war he won fame as a patriotic German Naval Officer, commanding U-Boats in the Mediterranean, and being decorated over and over again for exceptional bravery. Entering the Christian ministry after the war, he had risen swiftly to the pastorate of this famous Berlin church. He had carefully refrained from taking any part in politics, holding that to be out of accord with his position as a Christian minister. He had, however, as an individual German citizen, joined the National Socialist Party and voted the Nazi ticket in the election of 1933, which placed Hitler securely in power.

Pastor Niemoeller, in other words, was ready to support the Nazi government in all its political and social policies. It was only when that government overstepped the bounds to dictate to the church what it must preach, whom it must elect and obey as its bishops, and to set up a vast bureaucracy of Nazi politicians in charge of church affairs—it was only then that Pastor Niemoeller protested. For nearly four years, as head of a company of fearless Protestant ministers, he insisted on freedom for the church from state control. He was warned, he was threatened, his home was constantly entered and searched by the secret police.

In July, 1937, Martin Niemoeller was arrested. Taken to prison, he was held incommunicado for seven months, never being brought into court to find out the charges against him, never even having a copy of any formal indictment served on him in prison. He was simply left there alone behind the bars of his prison, while all that his friends inside and outside Germany could do was to agitate that he at least be tried. Finally he was tried in February and March, 1938, in proceedings from which the public, including Niemoeller's own wife, was excluded, proceedings so farcical that Niemoeller's lawyers at one point withdrew from the case, insisting that it was a travesty on justice. The sentence passed on Niemoeller was for seven months of incarceration and a fine of 1500 marks ($600). The fine was immediately paid and the Court held that Niemoeller, having already spent eight months in prison, could go free. Yet when this world-famous Christian minister stepped outside the doors of the courtroom, before he could so much as greet the wife and children who were waiting there for his release, he was immediately rearrested by the Nazi secret police and rushed off to a concentration camp, where he is held to this day. That is an almost unbelievable example of religious persecution of Protestant Christians in Germany.

The Niemoeller case is only one of many, but, because of his standing, his ability, his courageous conduct during the war, and his acceptance in very large measure of National Socialist principles, his case is historic and revolting to all sense of governmental decency.

Persecution of Catholics

The Nazi persecution of Catholics has been shrewdly camouflaged, first by the Concordat with the Pope which somewhat lulled all suspicion, and then by official denials, and where these would be too obviously false, by reckless and unscrupulous charges of immoral conduct against priests and other Catholics. Here are quoted a few extracts from the reliable *London Catholic Herald* and *The Commonweal.*

On December 31, 1937, the *Herald* contains the following:

> His Holiness has referred in very serious terms to Germany, stating that things must be called by their real names. "We wish to speak of the very sad fact of persecution in Germany, because we want to give things their proper name.
>
> "In Germany," the Pope went on, "there is a religious persecution. It is being said and has been said for a long time that that is not true. We know, however, that it is a persecution, and a grave one. Seldom there has been a persecution which was so serious, so terrible, so painful, and so sad in its deepest consequences. It is a persecution where neither the use of violence, nor the pressure of menaces, nor the deceptions of cunning and lie are missing."

The Commonweal, July 2, 1937, carries an article on "Nazi Persecution of Catholics" by Waldemar Curian:

> Waves of filth and fury have swirled up about Germany's priests and religions—waves that have their wellspring in the inner chambers that determine the press policy of the Third Reich. You cannot open a German newspaper without finding at least one account of a trial on statutory charges involving priests or religions as defendants. A newspaper has no choice in the matter of printing these reports. The Nazi policy intends that even the tiniest village should regard rectory and convent alike as dens of abomination. The radio, too, plays its part, and Nazi party organs carry news stories with such headlines as "Can the Church Stand the Truth?"; "Incredible Patience of the Hierarchy"; "Children Outraged in Convent Schools"; "Corruptors of Youth Clad in Cossacks"; "Spotless at the Altar, but Scandalous as Educators"; "A Devil in a Surplice."
>
> *Der Schwarze Korps* has a circulation of over 500,000. This is the official journal of the S. S., the "Black Bodyguard," whose leader, Himmler, is chief of the coördinated German police. This sheet unfailingly launches most devastating attacks against church and cloister, with respect for neither Pope nor Bishops. A few examples will serve. It carries a caricature of high church dignitaries, and creates the impression through the caption that a priest who has not run afoul of decency is "the individual case." Another cartoon is directed against the Bishop as follows: "How will I clean up this pigsty? Can't be done. So the dung stinks to high heaven. That will bring the police and they'll take care of it." And the police closed an episcopal convent with the contention that regulations there were of a sort that "represented a serious threat to morals."

Owing to the complete domination of the press and the Courts by the Nazi government, it is impossible effectively to refute these degrading charges.

Recent outbreaks against Cardinals Innitzer and Faulhaber and stern condemnation by the Pope of both anti-Catholicism and anti-Semitism show that these persecutions are growing progressively worse and are part and parcel of the Nazi philosophy of totalitarianism.

Under cover of these religious persecutions, the Nazi government is not overlooking the vast monetary advantage that is thus offered. The step from oppression, persecution, and "protective imprisonment" in concentration camps, to confiscation, baldly or under legal devices, of the victims' property is a small and diabolically logical one. No one outside the Nazi chieftains can possibly estimate the vast total amount of this ingenious sovereign racketeering. But even a rough guess shows it to run into billions of marks. The recent "Baron Munchhausen" fine extorted from German and Austrian Jews when an exiled and half-distracted seventeen-year old Polish boy shot a German Third Secretary in Paris shocked the world as the acme of senseless brutal governmental injustice. And of course when these innocent victims are completely cowed and despoiled of all means of subsistence, the stage is set for their exile, leaving their fate of life or death to the mercy of other nations. "Other nations!" What cares the Nazi master of propaganda, Herr Goebbels, about "other nations"? A recent Associated Press despatch from Berlin reads:

> If the foreign press invokes our human feelings, why we will be glad to present the Jews to them. If people say "Why, the Jews aren't doing anything," I say they provoke us by their very presence. What do we care about foreign countries anyway? The world should leave us alone. We are not harming anybody.

We now quote from state papers and addresses on what rights and duties arise to other nations in the face of persecution and oppression by one nation that violates the laws of humanity and of God, and that also foists heavy and unjust burdens upon other nations. And especially we cite the inspiring words and acts of our own government which, in times past, has had the courage and humanitarian impulse and has exercised the right to protest and condemn these inhumane practices.

This right is well recognized and is based on:

(a) The laws of humanity, of nature, and of God which transcend all man-made laws which violate them;

(b) The right to protection against the inevitable effect of despoiling and banishing by direct or indirect methods large numbers of men and women, who are thereby forced to seek life and home in other countries, thus making the question not a local but an international one; and

(c) The friendly moral right of every nation under the comity of nations to protest against outrages and inhumane conduct occurring in any country. The manner of protest may sometimes be open to criticism but the right of protest is undeniable.

Precedents of Sovereign Protests Against Outrages in Other Nations

Stowell, in his work in *Intervention in International Law,* p. 52, says that there are many instances of firm diplomatic protests in both hemispheres on different grounds, including governmental persecutions amounting to inhumane conduct.

Stowell says on page 63:

> Governmental persecution may be sufficiently gross to amount to inhumane conduct. Particularly frequent have been the instances of intolerance, that is, the denial to large numbers of persons of the liberty to profess their religion.

Both our government and our people have the proud record of expressing their moral protests against and condemnation of outrages on liberty, religion, and race emphatically and frequently.

In the early days of this Republic, President John Quincy Adams wrote:

> This principle, that a *whole nation* has a right to do whatever it pleases, cannot in any sense whatever be admitted as true. The eternal and immutable laws of justice and of morality are paramount to all human legislature.

The name Kossuth is loved by all who prize liberty. Austria and Russia combined to defeat Kossuth, and after he had taken refuge in Turkey they demanded his surrender. Here was a matter with which our country had no direct concern. Hungary, Austria, Russia, Turkey, all undoubtedly considered that the crushing of the Kossuth forces and whatever punitive action any of them desired to take, were matters altogether of internal policy with which the United States had rightfully nothing to do.

That was not the view of Americans of that day. They did not invite war, nor threaten a disruption of friendly relations, by voicing the moral indignation of this civilized nation. Daniel Webster, then a member of the United States Senate, declared in a speech in Boston:

> We have all had our sympathies enlisted in the Hungarian effort for liberty. We have all wept at its failure. Despotic power from abroad intervened to suppress the hope of free government in Hungary.—*Gentlemen, there is something on earth greater than arbitrary or despotic power, and that is the aroused indignation of the civilized world.*

Thereafter, having in the meantime become Secretary of State, Webster set forth the views of this government:

> While performing with strict and exact fidelity all their neutral duties, nothing shall deter either the government or the people of the United States from exercising at their own discretion, the rights belonging to them as an independent nation, and *of forming and expressing their own opinions,* freely and at all times, upon the great political events which may transpire among the civilized nations of the earth.

Kossuth was not put to death. *He was brought to this country on an American public vessel, after a resolution to that effect had been passed by Congress.* He was presented to the Chief Executive, to both Houses of Congress, and was honored throughout the land.

Czarist Russia seems to have been the model or prototype which is being followed in persecuting Jews, although the present government of Germany has broadened it to include Catholics and Protestants. On April 15, 1882, Secretary of State Frelinghuysen, dealing with the Russian outrages on Jews, gave instructions to our Ambassador to Russia "To express the hope that the Imperial Government would find means to cause the persecution of these unfortunate fellow-beings to cease."

These Russian persecutions called forth two notable meetings, one at the Mansion House in London on February 1, 1882, and the other in New York City, at Chickering Hall, held on the same day.

We quote excerpts from the London speeches of some of the greatest men of England of that day. *Resolutions were passed and sent to Prime Minister*

Gladstone to use his diplomatic influence to stop the outrages.

At this meeting the Earl of Shaftesbury, distinguished philanthropist and statesman, said in part:

> There may be, or there may not be, a precedent for such a meeting; but I hold that in these days of what is called the "solidarity of nations," of enlarged responsibilities and greatly increased force of public opinion, if there is not a precedent it ought to be established on this very day. I am glad that the people of England have come forward to make a solemn declaration that, in their belief, there are moral as well as material weapons; *that the moral weapons in the long run are the more effectual and the more permanent; and that it is our duty to resort to those moral weapons when for use of the material we have neither the right nor the power. . . .*

Lord Shaftesbury offered the following resolution:

> That in the opinion of this meeting the persecutions and the outrages which the Jews in many parts of the Russian dominion have for several months past suffered, are an offence to civilization to be deeply deplored.

The Bishop of London said:

> A few years back our country was horrified with accounts of atrocities committed in what were then provinces of the Turkish Empire. The country was moved, *but it had the consolation of knowing that though the sufferers were Christians, the perpetrators were almost all of another creed.* Now, alas, the case is the reverse. Those who have perpetrated these atrocities are men who bear the name of Christians; so that the persecutions of the Middle Ages, on which history has long set the stamp of reprobation, have been reproduced in the latter part of the 19th Century. . . . . Speaking here from this platform, I may without presumption, in the name of every member of the Church of England, second the resolutions which Lord Shaftesbury has proposed.

Cardinal Manning, on behalf of the Catholics, said:

> It is because I believe that we are high above the tumults and conflicts of party politics, that we are in the serene region of human justice, that I am here today. . . . . Further, I may say, that while we do not intend to touch upon any question in the internal legislation of Russia, still there are laws larger than any Russian legislation, laws which are equally binding in London, in St. Petersburg, and in Moscow—the laws of humanity, of nature, and of God—which are the foundation of all other laws; and if in any legislation these are violated, all nations of Christian Europe, the whole Commonwealth of civilized and Christian men, would instantly acquire a right to speak out loud. . . . . Is there any career of public utility, any path of honour, civil or military, in which the Jews have not stood side by side with their countrymen? . . . . For uprightness, for refinement, for generosity, for charity, for all the graces and virtues that adorn humanity, where, I ask, will be found examples brighter, or more full of true human excellence, than in this branch of the Hebrew race. . . . .
>
> There is but one word more I have to say . . . . there is a Book, my Lord, which is common to the race of Israel and to us Christians. That Book is a bond between us, and in that Book I read that the people of Israel are the oldest people upon the earth. Russias and Austrias and Englands are but of yesterday compared with the imperishable people, which—with an inextinguishable life and immutable traditions, and faith in God and the laws of God, scattered as it is all over the world, passing through the fires unscathed, trampled into the dust and yet never combining with the dust into which it is trampled—lives on, still a witness to us, a witness and a warning. We are in the bonds of brotherhood with it. The New Testament rests upon the Old. They believe in half of that for which we would give our lives. Let us, then, acknowledge that they are united with us in a common sympathy.

Canon Farrar, at the same meeting, said:

> . . . . The Jews are at once the noblest and the most trampled-upon nationality in the world. Their religion was the cradle of Christianity. The Jews have among them names which, as Sir Walter Scott says, as compared with any of our names, are like the gourd to the cedar, and which go back to the time when the voice of God shook the mercy-seat between the Cherubim. It is the Jewish nation that humanity owes the deepest debt of gratitude, and it is on that nation that humanity has inflicted the deepest wrongs.

James Bryce also addressed this meeting and said in part:

> I feel honoured in being asked to address this meeting . . . . to confirm the testimony already given, that those who then spoke out so strongly against atrocities committed by Mohammedans against Christians feel now similar indignation against the attacks made by Christians upon Jews. . . . .
>
> The resolution which I have to propose is as follows:
>
> "That the Lord Mayer be requested to forward a copy of these resolutions to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone and the Right Hon. Earl Granville, in the hope that Her Majesty's Government may be able, when an opportunity arises, to exercise a friendly influence with the Russian Government in accordance with the spirit of the preceding resolutions." . . . . It is, indeed, enough to make one blush for modern civilization to think that a people like the Jews—a people whose ancient literature is so sacred in our eyes, on whose ancient religion our own is based, who have rendered such eminent services to learning and science—in the Nineteenth Century should be subjected to such terrible persecution. . . . .

A mass meeting in New York City February 1, 1882, at Chickering Hall, was called at the request of ex-President U. S. Grant, Roscoe Conkling, and other distinguished American citizens. Mayor Grace of New York presided and made the following brief address:

> In the name of freedom of thought, of religious liberty, I feel that we are called upon to protest against the tyrannical illiberality of a government which permits the persecution of an entire people for the simple reason that they are of a peculiar race and peculiar faith. . . . . I am strongly reminded of the words of Pope Innocent IV in a letter which he wrote in defense of the Jews in 1247, where he says: "What a shame it is they should be more miserable under Christian princes than their ancestors were under Pharaoh."

The chief address was delivered by ex-Secretary of State William H. Evarts, who, in part, said:

> But it is said: do not nations correspond only through governments, and are not governments clothed with complete authority within the territories over which they rule, and are they not jealous of any intimations or suggestions made by friendly governments, however close their amity may be? Well, gentlemen, the time has gone when kings, couriers, and ships of war were the only messengers between nations and when state proclamations and announcements of ambassadors were the only messages that passed between nation and nation. All this wonderful apparatus of communication which the world rejoices in and uses every day; all this vast apparatus was not made for men and the transfusion of people with people, but the common diffusion of the world's common property in the interchange of thought, of feeling, and of purpose. All nations now speak directly to nations, under no constraint or formality, and under no difficulty of making themselves understood.

In 1891 the United States complained to the Russian Government of its harsh treatment of the Jews, which forced them to emigrate in large numbers to this country. On his instructions to the American Ministry, February 18, 1891, Secretary of State James G. Blaine, spoke of the action taken by the Russian Government as a step which

> would not only wound the universal and innate sentiment of humanity, but would suggest the difficult problem of affording an immediate asylum to a million or more of exiles without seriously deranging the conditions of labor and social organization in other communities.

Mr. Blaine further observed:

> The Government of the United States does not assume to dictate the internal policy of other nations, or to make suggestions as to what their municipal laws should be or as to the manner in which they should be administered. *Nevertheless, the mutual duties of nations require that each should use its power with a due regard for the results which its exercise produces on the rest of the world.*

The American representative was directed to read this instruction to the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs. President Benjamin Harrison, in his annual message, December 9, 1891, said:

> This government has found occasion to express in a friendly spirit, but with much earnestness, to the government of the Tsar, its serious concern because of the harsh measures now being enforced against the Hebrews in Russia. By the revival of anti-Semitic laws, long in abeyance, great numbers of those unfortunate people have been constrained to abandon their homes and leave the Empire by reason of the impossibility of finding subsistence within the pale to which it is sought to confine them. The immigration of these to the United States—many other countries being closed to them—is largely increasing and is likely to assume proportions which may make it difficult to find homes and employment for them here and to seriously affect the labor market. It is estimated that over 1,000,000 will be forced from Russia within a few years. The Hebrew is never a beggar; he has always kept the law —life by toil—often under severe and oppressive civil restrictions. It is also true that no race, sect, or class has more fully cared for its own than the Hebrew race. But the sudden transfer of such a multitude, under conditions that tend to strip them of their small accumulations and to depress their energies and courage, is neither good for them nor for us. *The banishment, whether by direct decree or by not less certain indirect methods, of so large a number of men and women is not a local question. A decree to leave one country is, in the nature of things, an order to enter another—some other.* This consideration, as well as the suggestions of humanity, furnishes ample ground for the remonstrances which we have presented to Russia, while our historic friendship for that government cannot fail to give assurance that our representations are those of a sincere well-wisher.

In 1902 Secretary of State Hay called the attention of the powers to Roumania's violation of the Treaty of Berlin and her unjustifiable oppression of the Jews. Stowell, p. 69, comments:

> As the correspondence indicates, Secretary Hay's intention was to demand justice for the oppressed Jews in conformity with the principles of international law and the dictates of humanity. This action was taken, as he said in his dispatch of August 11, 1902, to Mr. McCormick "not alone because it [the United States] has unimpeachable ground to remonstrate against the resulting injury to itself, but in the name of humanity."

The French Government also took a hand in this protest. Stowell says, p. 67:

> From Paris, the French Consulate at Jassy had received the following telegram of instructions: "The persecutions begun against the Jews at Jassy cause here a just and general indignation. Take prompt and energetic steps to put a stop to an iniquity which is a dishonor to the Roumanian Government."

The Kishineff massacre in Russia in 1903 led to other meetings of protest in the United States, notably one at Carnegie Hall, New York, May 27, 1903, over which Mayor Seth Low presided; Carl Schurz, at this meeting spoke these memorable words:

> The persecution and maltreatment of human beings on account of their race or their religious belief is always an offense not only unjust to the victim, but also degrading to the offender. But the persecution and maltreatment of the Jews, as mankind has witnessed it, and is now witnessing it in several countries, has been not only especially barbarous in the ferocity of its excesses, but in a singular degree self-debasing and cowardly in the invention of the reasons adduced for its justification. These horrors are not only one more revelation of the ulterior tendency of a movement which here and there even assumes the mask of superior respectability. Here is the whole question again brought before the tribunal of the conscience of mankind. May this event serve to put in clearer light the fact that the history of the world exhibits no more monumental record of monstrous injustice than the persecutions inflicted upon the Jews during so many centuries. We may then also hope to see the other fact universally recognized that wherever the Jewish race, with its wonderful vitality and its remarkable productiveness of talent and energy, enjoys the equal protection of just laws and a due appreciation of its self-respect, it will, far from remaining a race of aliens, furnish its full contingent of law-abiding, peaceable, industrious, public-spirited, and patriotic citizenship, vying with the best.

Ex-President Grover Cleveland, at this meeting, made this notable contribution:

> The influences which have called us together tonight grow out of our recognition of the promptings of Christian civilization and our dutiful devotion to the best and deepest of our national characteristics. This demonstration furnishes cheering and reassuring evidence that our American sympathy for the oppressed and abused, wherever they may be, our American love of humanity, and our attachment to justice and right, are still active and unimpaired. There is another American trait inwoven with the warp and woof of our national character, which is here exhibited in most gratifying freshness and strength. Our people, when their sympathies are touched, when their humane instincts are challenged, and when their hatred of oppression is aroused, are not afraid to speak; and in such circumstances it is not their habits to smother or cautiously soften their words.
>
> Every American humane sentiment has been shocked by a late attack on the Jews in Russia—an attack murderous, atrocious and in every way revolting. As members of the family of mankind, and as citizens of a free nation, we are here to give voice to the feeling that should stir every true man, and every American worthy of the name. There is something intensely horrible in the wholesale murder of unoffending defenseless men, women, and children, who have been tacitly, if not expressly, assured of safety under the protection of a professedly civilized government. Such things give rise to a distressing fear that even the enlightenment of the Twentieth Century has neither destroyed nor subdued the barbarity of human nature, nor wholly redeemed the civilized world from "man's inhumanity to man. . . . . ."
>
> Let the people of the United States, gathered together in such assemblages as this, in every part of the land, fearlessly speak to the civilized world, protesting against every pretense of civilization that permits medieval persecution, against every bigoted creed that forbids religious toleration and freedom of conscience, against all false enlightenment that excuses hatred and cruelty towards any race of men, *and against all spurious forms of government protection that withhold from any human being the right to live in safety and toil in peace.*

At a Chicago meeting on May 18, 1903, a petition was approved and delivered to Secretary of State John Hay, under President Theodore Roosevelt. Whereupon Secretary Hay said:

> No person of ordinary humanity can have heard without deep emotion the story of the cruel outrages inflicted upon the Jews of Kishineff. These lamentable events have caused the profoundest impression throughout the world, but most especially in this country, where there are so many of your co-religionists who form such a desirable element of our population in industry, thrift, public spirit, and commercial morality. Nobody can ever make the Americans think ill of the Jews as a class or as a race. . . . . We know them too well. In the painful crisis through which we are now passing the

Jews of the United States have given evidence of the highest qualities—generosity, love of justice, and power of self-restraint.

President Theodore Roosevelt took a firm stand in this matter and, as might be expected, was not afraid to deliver a resounding moral protest to the Russian Government in the face of these brutal outrages. Quoting from Thayer's *Life of Roosevelt,* pp. 229, 230:

> Russian mobs ran amuck and massacred many Jews in the city of Kishineff. The news of this atrocity reached the outside world slowly: when it came, the Jews of Western Europe, and especially those of the United States, cried out in horror, held meetings, drew up protests, and framed petitions asking the Tsar to punish the criminals. Leading American Jews besought Roosevelt to plead their cause before the Tsar. As it was well known that the Tsar would refuse to receive such petitions, and would regard himself as insulted by whatever nation should lay them before him by official diplomatic means, the world wondered what Roosevelt would do. He took one of his short cuts. He sent the petitions to our Ambassador at Petrograd, accompanying them with a letter which recited the atrocities and grievances. In this letter, which was handed to the Russian Secretary of State, our government asked whether his Majesty, the Tsar, would condescend to receive the petitions. Of course, the reply was "No" but the letter was published in all countries, so that the Tsar also knew of the petitions, and of the horrors which called them out. In this fashion, the former ranchman and Rough Rider outwitted, by what I may call his straightforward guile, the crafty diplomats of the Romanoffs.

Commenting on this, Stowell says:

> Finally public opinion in America became thoroughly aroused, and on December 17, 1911, *the American Ambassador officially notified the Russian Government* of the termination of the treaty of 1832.

In 1915, in the early stages of the World War, there occurred the awful Turkish persecution of Armenian Christians, and the United States, despite the inherent dangers involved, intervened diplomatically on the dictate of common humanity. Stowell, p. 80, comments as follows on this action:

> This action is of especial interest since it took place at a critical moment of the war (1915). The New York *Evening Post,* October 5, 1915, prints the following report from Washington: "The Turkish Government will be formally notified that unless the massacre of Armenians ceases, friendly relations between the American people and the people of Turkey will be threatened. Instructions to that effect had gone today to Ambassador Morgenthau at Constantinople for presentation to the Foreign Office."

Religious Persecution of Catholics in Mexico in 1935

On January 31, 1935, there was submitted to the Senate by the Senior Senator from Idaho, former head of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, a resolution protesting against the persecution of "Christians of all faiths" in Mexico, but relating mainly to the persecution of Catholics at the time, and calling for the appointment of a Senatorial Investigating Committee. The Borah resolution provides:

> WHEREAS serious anti-religious outbreaks have occurred in Mexico under the regime of the National Revolutionary Party now in control of the Government of Mexico; and
>
> WHEREAS the persecutions of Christians of all faiths now being practiced in Mexico have aroused indignation and protest throughout the civilized world; and
>
> WHEREAS it has been the national policy of the Government and the dominant Revolutionary Party of Mexico to discourage religious profession and obliterate religious worship; and
>
> WHEREAS the present Mexican Government prohibits the time-honored practice of private religious instruction and education of children and compels parents as an only alternative to ignorance to educate their children in schools teaching hostility to orthodox religion; and
>
> WHEREAS Christian residents of Mexico who complain of such intolerance are flagrantly mistreated and abused: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved,* That the Senate of the United States deems it fitting and proper to protest the anti-religious campaign and practices of the present rulers of Mexico; and that it views with the gravest concern such ruthless persecution of helpless men and women who have become the innocent victims of anti-religious persecution; be it further
>
> *Resolved,* That the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate, or a sub-committee thereof, be authorized to conduct hearings and receive such evidence as may be presented relating to religious persecution and anti-religious compulsion and agitation in Mexico for the purpose of determining the policy of the United States in reference to this vital problem and in what way we may best serve the cause of tolerance and religious freedom.

Conclusion on Question One

Thus we see in the actions and precedents of our past Executives and Secretaries of State, and of our past and present statesmen and publicists, a clear path of duty which we owe to the laws of nature, of God and humanity. Protests by any nation against the infractions of these sacred highest laws are both permissible and laudable, and should be received in a friendly spirit as a part of the comity of nations. Every effort should be made, just as between personal friends, to induce their assuagement and cessation on the basis of good will and mutual coöperation. Under our Constitution and Bill of Rights, America permits no invasion of freedom of religion, no laws of persecution against minorities, and hence is as well justified as any nation to urge the abandonment of such practices as make for ill will and economic as well as political friction. The main obstacle to good will, which is indispensable to world harmony, is that some nations seem to regard it as a one-way street, something that is virtuous and praiseworthy when extended to them, but lacking in national merit when required of them. Let us try to break down this barrier not only by reciprocal commercial treaties but by reciprocal moral conduct. In this way only can the family of nations be reunited.

Our Duty to America

We come then to the second great question which confronts us: What are our duties and obligations in the protection of our Constitutional democracy, our matchless liberties established and cherished for 150 years?

First of all, it is obviously incumbent upon us to regard with open eyes the period in which we live, to strip away all pretenses as to the forces which today work most powerfully to establish the nature of international life, and thus to comprehend the dangers from which our democracy must be safeguarded. If there are vital portions of the earth, if there are great nations in which the sanctity of the pledged word is no longer observed, in which rule by force or by the threat of force has supplanted rule by law and by the appeal to reason, an awakened democracy must look squarely in the face the dangers which a return to the arbitrament

of the sword constitutes for all nations who seek a stable and peaceful world order.

It would appear that certain great figures do not care to have the democratic peoples thus realistically consider and openly discuss the spread of arbitrary rule based on armed might. For the public leaders or the press of the democracies to tell the truth about this development, and to warn against its menace, is, we are told by one European ruler, "warmongering." And a European minister of foreign affairs has recently made the unprecedented suggestion that it is a part of the duty of the accredited diplomatic representatives of the democracies to see that newspaper correspondents reporting to their countries shall send no reports from the totalitarian states which shall disclose the extent and nature of these anti-democratic developments. All such candid recognition of facts as facts is stigmatized, in the highest quarters, as "war agitation."

We are for peace. To accuse this nation of "war agitation" is to malign the principles of every administration in our history. It is to distort and defame the spirit and desire of every American citizen. Search our nation from one end to the other and you will scarcely find one person in it who is not wholly, honestly, and passionately desirous of peace. Our people have no desire but, in the words of Scripture, to "live peacefully with all men." They will sacrifice to almost any length in order to preserve peace in all our international relations. But it is a just and lasting peace to which their hearts are devoted, not an armed and rearming truce between wars and conquests.

For that reason, while we persist in our determination to maintain peace in all our international relations, we are determined likewise to provide adequate protection for our free institutions within our own borders and to coöperate with all the other republics of this hemisphere against encroachments upon the democratic liberties which they, like we, have gained by the sacrifice of blood and treasure. We do not intend, we will not permit, our armed strength by threat or otherwise to be used in aggression anywhere in the world. But we cannot close our eyes to the perils in which our democracy walks at the present hour, and so we mean to use the limitless resources which are in our hands to forge weapons of protection, to the end that the most precious possession of all, our human liberty, may be made secure against sabotage or attack.

For the supreme stake for which we in the democracies live today, and if need be which we will defend to the death, is human liberty. It is this which our brave fathers have bequeathed to us, the one pearl of surpassing price which we must retain and hold fast even if it cost us all else that we have. Human liberty, the rights of men proclaimed in our Declaration of Independence and given legal definition in our federal Constitution, that irreducible dignity of the human spirit which is the basis of our political institutions and which lies at the very heart of the religious faiths espoused by most of our people,—these are the heritage of our past, and these are the possessions which make life worth living for us today. Freedom and liberty are the ends for which this government was born and the ends for which we, who love this nation and believe in its destiny, live. And we will not permit any actual or potential invader to place in jeopardy the expectation that our children shall receive unimpaired from our hands this boon which our fathers handed to us as a sacred trust.

We ask freedom to maintain and conduct our own forms of republican government and individual liberty in this hemisphere, as we freely grant the right of others to their own desired forms of government, dictatorial, autocratic, or totalitarian. But under no circumstances, pursuant to no pleas or threats, will we allow the autocratic forms of government known in other parts of the earth to become established in the New World or to undermine or destroy the liberties of our American republics.

Furthermore, it is evident that the time has come when we must reaffirm our unmistakable intention of defending our liberties, not only from all attack from without, but equally from those more sinister and dangerous attacks which arise on occasion within our own national life. This liberty which we cherish—what is it but that freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom from search and seizure, freedom to worship after the dictates of conscience which are assured to all Americans in the constitutional Bill of Rights? And these measures of freedom can only be secure in a society without discrimination because of religion, race, or any other form of division. Yet from time to time we discover, operating in our midst, movements which have as their avowed aims the introduction of these very causes of social discrimination and disability. Against all such alien intrusions which seek to set up within American life communities dedicated to alien ideals and inimical to American conceptions of liberty and democracy, we must set our faces with unflinching determination. Such influences have no proper place in this land "conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

If asked, therefore, to declare the policy of the United States in this period of peculiar international stress, we would affirm—

First, that as this nation is dedicated to the attainment and perpetuation of human freedom, the government and the people of this nation regard it as their responsibility to speak out, in the name of liberty and the dignity of humanity, against all forms of persecution and oppression, wherever they may appear and whatever forms they may take; and

Second, that this nation, the gift to us of the sacrifices and blood and toil of our fathers who thought no price too high to pay for liberty, intends to preserve here a democracy so strong that it will provide an impregnable home of freedom for ourselves and our children, while it continues to hold aloft its historic symbol of hope and promise for the vision and inspiration of the liberty-loving of all mankind.

Above all, the question for the American people is not "do you want war?" No one in his right mind would answer that question save only to reply with a thunderous "no." Such a question itself begs the question. "Do you want liberty?", "do you want freedom of conscience?", "do you want to preserve American ideals of individual and religious liberty?" And "do you care deeply enough for these blessings to defend them, to fight for them, if necessary to die fighting for them?" These are the real questions, answers to which the American people are not even in the shadow of a doubt. For is there an American "with soul so dead" who, with our priceless liberties in peril, would not cry out with Nathan Hale: "I regret that I have but one life to give to my country"?

Foreign Barbarism and Our Duty

VICTOR S. YARROS

It is astonishing, yet true, that a good many Liberals and sincere Christians resent and truculently criticize President Roosevelt, Secretary Ickes, Senator Pittman, and other high public officials for their frank and vigorous assaults on the savage, vicious, and utterly stupid treatment of Jews, independent Catholics, and self-respecting intellectuals who venture to object to the various manifestations of Hitler's sadism and paranoia, or to Mussolini's charlatanism and quackery.

These persons seem to think that it is our moral duty, as well as our national interest, to remain silent as regards foreign affairs, no matter how monstrous and bestial the measures and policies of the totalitarian dictators may be. That view is supported neither by history, religion, nor ethical principles of civilized communities. What is described as "meddling," or "putting our noses in German or Italian affairs" is neither more nor less, in the circumstances actually existing, than performing an imperative moral obligation, exercising a clear right, rendering a signal service to human decency and elementary justice.

Did Jesus and his first disciples refrain from denouncing wrong and iniquity in foreign countries? Did they keep their noses out of Greece, Rome, and other countries wholly foreign to them? What did they conceive to be their mission and their duty?

Since when has it been improper and inexpedient for parliaments and congresses to protest indignantly against outrages and crimes perpetrated by foreign governments? Did Gladstone respect the foreign policies, or the domestic ones, of the Turkish tyrant of his day? Did he not stand up and ask God "to damn Abdul-Hamid"? Was that reprehensible meddling?

When the United States Congress passed ringing resolutions condemning the Russian autocracy and its secret police for instigating pogroms in the Ukraine against helpless Jews, was it guilty of gratuitous interference in foreign affairs?

When President Wilson virtually advised the German people to repudiate the irresponsible Kaiser and negotiate peace through constitutional representatives and a responsible cabinet, was he playing the part of a meddler and marplot?

If President Roosevelt believes that the dictators of today are half-insane enemies of peace and civilization, and that democracies must recognize the perils they face and take adequate measures of defense, is he needlessly and recklessly endangering the peace he is anxious to serve?

The world, it is often said, is becoming smaller and smaller. No national major policy is without serious effects in other countries. And when certain policies or specific measures are so brutal, iniquitous, and shameful that they outrage the conscience and moral sense of all civilized men and women, is it possible, is it desirable for parliaments, presidents, and public leaders generally to remain silent and suppress and repress their natural wrath?

There are millions in Germany, and in Italy, who are profoundly grateful to President Roosevelt and other American statesmen for their brave and bold protests against Hitler's atrocities. These millions are terrorized and gagged. But they expect the free nations to do what *they* cannot do—speak out, urge others to speak out, and thus voice the sentiments of civilization.

And there is another important point to consider—one recently emphasized by Mr. Oswald G. Villard, the distinguished liberal journalist and publicist. Mr. Villard directs attention to the fact—too often overlooked—that the anti-Jewish policies of the Hitlerized Reich are *not* a purely domestic issue. Germany is not free to do what she likes with her Jews—to take away their property without due process of law, to deprive them of civil and political rights, to heap insult upon them, to force them into exile, to slander and libel them as a race, to instigate riots and pogroms against them. The whole civilized world is deeply and vitally affected by such atrocious and barbarous conduct. It cannot remain indifferent to the fate of German refugees. It must provide for them, find them employment, save them from epidemics and death.

The decent nations, declares Mr. Villard, ought to have protested against the first anti-Jewish measures adopted by Hitler and warned him and his rabid followers that persistence in such measures would lead to a general boycott of Germany and even to a cessation of diplomatic relations with her. The American President, according to Mr. Villard, should have sent for the German ambassador and told him in plain and terse terms that he would take the most vigorous action against Germany—short of war—and invite other civilized governments to follow his example.

Would not all humane and enlightened persons everywhere, not excepting Germany, have heartily applauded such a course, and would not an economic, financial, and social boycott of Germany have had a sobering effect even upon the mad Nazis?

The world *had* the moral right, and the moral duty, to force Hitler and his piratical crew to respect the elementary decencies of civilization, and to refrain from measures which have shocked all *real* Christians, all real and intelligent friends of rational order and genuine progress.

The painful truth is that the "neutral" Americans who regret or criticize President Roosevelt's moderate words and acts in behalf of the German Jews are at heart anti-Semitic—and abysmally ignorant of history, religion, and ethics as well. Anti-Semitism is an ugly phenomenon, but it not only exists in the United States, it is apparently growing. Being an ugly, disgraceful, and stupid movement, it should not be blinked at. It should be challenged in the open, and realistically diagnosed. The press and the pulpit should discuss it systematically and thoroughly. Charges from any half-responsible source should be probed and passed upon. Falsehood should be branded as such. Where the hatred or contempt for Jews is irrational, the result of prejudices inculcated during early childhood, that fact should be brought home to the carriers of the poisonous prejudices, and they should be made ashamed of themselves. Anti-Semitism will not long survive candid discussion. To begin with, all Christians are spiritually Semites, as the Pope has reminded his church. And are Protestants less Semitic spiritually than the Catholics? They would hardly care to make an affirmative

answer. Even those who do not believe in the divinity of Jesus profess to revere and admire him as a prophet, teacher, and leader. And who is not inspired and moved by the lesser Hebrew prophets, by their courage, their moral fervor, their sublime faith in righteousness?

To repeat, moral neutrality toward Germany's anti-Jewish atrocities argues callousness, conscious or unconscious anti-Semitism, and amazing ignorance.

The Deaf and Blind in Germany

HELEN KELLER

Judging from the periodicals in Braille I read and countless letters I have received, the welfare of the Teutonic blind has deteriorated. There is a large federation of blind Germans with headquarters in Berlin and Dresden. About a hundred and fifty deaf-blind form a part of this union. The neediest among them are provided with some apparatus and sheets of Braille paper, but the blind of greater Germany generally are not as well off as they used to be.

Before the Nazis came into power, the sightless received important financial aid from private sources, but at present philanthropy throughout Germany is facing a serious crisis, and, as always in the cutting of budgets, the blind suffer most. I do not know the number of refugees without sight. On account of their handicap few countries, if any, will admit them.

There is no respite for my bruised mind and aching heart from accounts of blind or deaf persons under Nazi dictatorship who suffer because they hold independent views, or are of Jewish descent. Their plight is caused by the same inhumanity that debars the children of nonconformists from school, spits upon them openly and leaves them to starve. Consistently every obstacle is placed in the way of educating or employing the Semite blind. They are excluded from all associations for the handicapped and centers of good will, so that they are robbed of spiritual sunshine and the few recreations their misfortune has left them. Their lot is doubly bleak.

Among the incidents of the sadistic terrorism inflicted upon Vienna after the Anschluss was the expulsion of the faculty and students from the Israelitish Institute for the Blind. Although the Director's life was in danger, yet he would not quit Vienna until he had secured whatever protection was possible for the little children, but the adult blind were dispersed, and they are still drifting everywhere. Before the Israelitish Institute was closed, many of its blind had been rehabilitated with rare ability for intellectual pursuits, excellent workmanship, and a degree of self-support. Now this priceless treasure—this one ewe-lamb—has been torn from them, and no relief is granted.

If the deaf-blind are found guilty of not being full-blooded Aryans, the Nazi regime stamps them also with racial inferiority. One of them, an Austrian whom I have known through correspondence for twenty years, writes me that she finds life conditions peculiarly hard because she is both a liberal Catholic and a daughter of the Jewish race. She has a gift of poetry. I have a sketch of her life in German verse which was to have been broadcasted, but the Nazis forbade her even this harmless bit of self-expression, and she cannot get any of her literary work made public. Her world has now become as small as the tomb! So the story of the unfortunate who belong to the persecuted goes on endlessly, and there is no visible hope of redress.

These injustices crushing intelligence and virtue in defenseless afflicted people of another race are without excuse or parallel. Before such wantonness, philosophy staggers, and faith is sore tried.

Out of my own blessedness in mind and freedom I cry to whoever may read these words: Hold fast to democracy! Never take it for granted. Cherish it and renew it like the blood that keeps your heart beating. For democracy alone safeguards the art of thinking by which we, blind and seeing, normal and hindered, may create lives worthy of human beings.

John Haynes Holmes
Editor

UNITY

Curtis W. Reese
Managing Editor

Introducing UNITY to new readers, we offer a trial subscription of . . .

6 MONTHS for $1.00

A Journal of Free and Critical Opinion

Published semi-monthly. Regular subscription $3.00.

UNITY
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago

Please enter my subscription for a trial period of six months, for which I enclose $1.00.

Name ..... Street .....

City ..... State .....

Correspondence

Help for One Who Has Helped Many

Editor of UNITY:

The name of Pierre Ramus is known throughout the international peace movement, but it may not be generally known that this veteran anti-militarist is now a fugitive from the Nazi regime, and is forbidden to work in the country which has given him sanctuary. He is therefore entirely dependent on the assistance given him by those who do not forget his heroic and life-long devotion to the cause of peace.

It is hoped that a publisher will be found for his book on *The Racial Problem—Peace and Mankind,* and this matter is already in hand; but in the meantime Ramus and his wife must live.

If those who would like to demonstrate their pacifist solidarity by giving a comrade in great distress a helping hand, care to send him a donation through me, it occurred to me that a fund might be organized for his assistance, the money disbursed in small regular sums which would give him security for six months at least, during which time his book may be placed. I have already received £5 from Laurence Housman, author of the play *Victoria Regina,* for the purpose of starting this proposed fund. Ramus' need, obviously, is not for spasmodic gifts, but for some solution to the problem of existence for himself and all in his position, and I understand that the Peace Pledge Union is shortly to go into this matter.

The peace movement throughout the world owes a great deal to Ramus, and a man in his position cannot live by sympathy alone—or even by casual small donations here and there. Hence this idea of building up a fund which will provide a few months of security during which time some revision of the laws governing refugees may have been effected.

Ramus has been robbed of all his possessions by the Nazis, even of his manuscripts, including the finished manuscript of his book, *Violence, Non-Violence, and the Social Revolution,* which he is now at work rewriting.

It is well known that he has suffered imprisonment in the past, like many others, for his pacifist ideals, and well known, too, that he has helped many others in his time. He is known personally to many pacifist leaders in the United States.

I devoutly hope that in my effort to assist this good pacifist comrade I shall receive the coöperation of all who recognize the importance of pacifist solidarity at this critical juncture of world affairs.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.

London, England.

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 98)

the German emissions of the B. B. C. (British broadcasting stations) are a terrible nuisance to the Gestapo men who try by all means to interfere with the reception. The ingenuity of the underground militants has overcome Goebbels' invention, the very cheap "People's Radio," which is ordinarily unfit to take short-wave transmissions: underground people have issued instructions how to adapt the "People's Radio" for short wave and have outwitted the sly propaganda minister. The mail that the Freedom-Station is receiving—in a roundabout way, of course—proves its efficiency. A survey among a group of twenty conservatives taken at random shows that thirteen, that is 65 per cent, are listening to the German transmissions of the B. B. C.

The last two months showed a threefold increase of underground publications inside Germany. To a high degree the general anti-war feeling is also an anti-Nazi feeling and, what is even more significant, an anti-Hitler feeling. For, since September, Hitler is no longer excluded from criticism by large groups of the population. The opposition movement develops with less danger than before, because voluntary denunciation of opponents to the Gestapo has considerably decreased. Many people, who in the past refused to participate in opposition activities, are now rendering help and are becoming active. This is noticeable not only among former trade-unionists but also in Catholic circles. In spite of the increasing activities, losses through arrests of active oppositionists have diminished, because they are now more amply protected by popular sympathy.

Six underground peasant newspapers (mimeographed) are now regularly published compared with the two of a few months ago, yet, in the last half-year, not a single leader of the peasant opposition has been caught by the Gestapo. Three underground army newspapers (also mimeographed) circulate regularly among officers and non-commissioned officers. The Gestapo chief, Himmler, keeps on arresting army officers, but the real leaders remain undiscovered. Even among the police force, two underground newspapers are published with astonishing regularity; this especially drives Himmler furious.

In March and April on the fences and buildings of the coal mines in Upper Silesia and in the Ruhr there appeared painted slogans expressing sympathy for Czechoslovakia and Poland. Many miners had to go through Gestapo examination with all its appalling cruelty, and some were taken to concentration camps. But the slogan-painting continues, and Nazis working hard at the removal of these signs are a frequent sight. Stickers denouncing high prices and low wages are pasted by what the Germans call "ghost hands" on the walls of factories and offices. Cleverly disguised pamphlets describing Germany's desperate economic situation go from hand to hand, although their possession is punishable by death. Factory meetings of the Nazi organization "German Labor Front" break down because of the barrage of embarrassing questions. Sunday services and church processions are packed. Underground theological lectures are arranged often and attended well. But the Gestapo is unable to find out the men behind the scene.

Germany of 1939 is not what it used to be in 1937 when its people took unwillingly but patiently the heavy burden of the Nazi regime. They talk in street cars and subways, in churches, offices and factories about the fate Hitler is leading their country to. The more of the so-called vital space ("Lebensraum") that is won by the Nazis outside of Germany because of the weakness of democracies, the more the vital space of the Nazi regime within the German people narrows down. They have finally, after six years of horrible lessons, understood to what abyss Hitler is taking them.

In 1939 it is not an easy task for Hitler to convince the troubled German people that it might be necessary for them to go to war for Danzig or a road across the Polish Corridor, or for Italy's so-called Mediterranean interests. If the German opposition can keep up its present pace of growth, he might be unable to convince them at all. The German underground movement is a highly important factor in favor of peace.

The Hour (New York City).

"Christianity—Religion for Slaves"

Paris.—Hitler's directions to the leaders of youth in Germany and Austria, as the basis for their public propaganda, have recently been published in the French Catholic paper, *La Croix.* Some of them are as follows:

"Christianity is a religion for slaves and imbeciles because it declares the last shall be first and the happy are the poor in spirit. Christianity is the same as Communism. Christianity puts on the same basis Negroes and Germans.

"The New Testament is a Jewish invention of the four evangelists; the doctrine has been copied from a Hindu legend of a certain Jischnu Christa. Christianity has always been alien and hostile to the German people and its unity. The Bible is the continuation of the Talmud; it is an entirely Jewish work, particularly the Old Testament.

"Christianity corrupted the Germans because it gave them knowledge of things of which they were previously ignorant—adultery and theft. Evil disappears, good remains. On that account the Catholic Church should disappear.

"The thought of a universal Messiah could only exist in a perverted people. A good people has no need of a saviour.

"Nero had good reason to persecute the Christians. He has extirpated the Jewish spirit, that is to say, Christianity."

Nofrontier News Service.